UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIFTH COMMITTEE
46th meeting
held on
Saturday, 7 December 1991
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 46th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 107: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.38, A/C.1/46/L.41, A/C.1/46/L.14 and A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended, concerning agenda items 65, 58, 61 (f) and 60 (b)

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/46/L.7 concerning agenda item 131

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.9 concerning agenda item 74

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and A/46/L.28 concerning agenda item 19

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.5 concerning agenda item 75

Administrative and financial arrangements regarding the United Nations International Drug Control Programme

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-57787 5497S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.5/46/SR.46
13 December 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 107: PROPOSED PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1992-1993 (continued)

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.38, A/C.1/46/L.41, A/C.1/46/L.14 and A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1, as orally amended, concerning agenda items 65, 58, 61 (f) and 60 (b) (A/46/7/Add.11; A/C.5/46/40, A/C.5/46/42, A/C.5/46/43 and A/C.5/46/44)

1. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that conference-servicing costs of $1,179,800 and non-conference-servicing costs of $984,100 had been indicated by the Secretary-General in respect of the four draft resolutions. The conference-servicing costs would be covered under section 32 of the proposed programme budget and no additional appropriations were being requested by the Secretary-General. With regard to non-conference-servicing costs, the Advisory Committee noted that no alternative courses of action had been identified in respect of some of the statements of programme budget implications, as required under the operation of the contingency fund.

2. The Advisory Committee, in paragraphs 18 to 21 of its report (A/46/7/Add.11), explained the Secretary-General's request for an amount of $318,500 relating to the establishment by the Department for Disarmament Affairs in New York of a universal and non-discriminatory Register of Conventional Arms. An unprogrammed amount of $329,800 had been included in the initial proposals of the Secretary-General for 1992-1993 in anticipation of decisions in the area of disarmament at the forty-sixth session, which could now be utilized to finance the Register of Conventional Arms.

3. The Advisory Committee, in paragraphs 9 to 17 of its report, considered the First Committee's request that the administrative expenses of the regional centres for peace and disarmament in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean should be financed from the regular budget. Currently only the Directors of the centres were so financed. The Advisory Committee had serious reservations regarding the procedure followed by the First Committee, and had reaffirmed its competence, together with that of the Fifth Committee, in administrative and budgetary matters.

4. It had originally been intended that the centres would be financed from extrabudgetary resources, and their operational programmes were so funded. Nevertheless, the actual level of those operational programmes was not clear, which made it difficult to assess the level of administrative support needed. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee had not been able to determine whether the amount of $600,000 requested by the Secretary-General was justified, and had requested additional information. It appeared that even if that amount was provided under the regular budget the viability of the centres would still not be ensured without adequate provision of extrabudgetary resources to finance the operational programme of the centres.

(Mr. Mselle)

5. Such considerations had led the Advisory Committee to formulate the comments contained in paragraph 17 of its report. The Advisory Committee was not rejecting the Secretary-General's proposals, but simply noting that, should the General Assembly accept the First Committee's recommendations, the Secretary-General should submit a further report, at which time the Advisory Committee would inform the Fifth Committee of the level of administrative support required.

6. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 concerning agenda item 65.

7. He would take it that the Fifth Committee, on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General and on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, wished to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.38 and should the Conference on the Indian Ocean be convened at Colombo, it was the understanding of the Secretary-General that the host Government would defray the actual additional costs directly or indirectly involved in meeting at Colombo, in accordance with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 40/243.

8. It was so decided.

9. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take action on the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.41 concerning agenda item 58.

10. He would take it that the Fifth Committee, on the basis of the report of the Secretary-General and on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, wished to recommend to the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.41, it would be necessary to add the following under activity 2 (b) "Substantive services" of subprogramme 1 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993:

> "(v) Group of Experts designated in 1991 by the United Nations in cooperation with OAU within the framework of the implementation of General Assembly resolution 45/56 A (one session in 1991)."

and that it was estimated that additional appropriations of $48,400 would be required under section 5 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

11. It was so decided.

12. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to take up the statement of programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 concerning agenda item 61 (f).

13. Mr. TALAVERA (Peru) said that regional cooperation in the field of security and disarmament had shown the worth of confidence-building measures, in view of which the regional centres for peace and disarmament must be provided with effective support. The centres were currently unable to operate at their full potential owing to a lack of financial stability. The activities of the centres had so far been funded from voluntary contributions, but they were inadequate. Funding the administrative costs of the centres would represent a highly cost-effective use of resources. Regular budget funding would also encourage a high level of voluntary contributions for substantive activities. Once the financial stability of the centres was assured, there would be no need for further requests for funding from the United Nations.

14. With respect to the reservations expressed by the Advisory Committee regarding the financing of the regional centres, his delegation viewed the First Committee decision as purely political, and felt that the Fifth Committee's role was simply to establish the most efficient means of implementing that decision.

15. Concerning the Advisory Committee's view (A/46/7/Add.11, para. 11) that the First Committee's decision should have been preceded by a report justifying the administrative support being requested, and that unless sufficient voluntary contributions were received to finance substantive activities, mere financing of the administrative expenses from the regular budget was not likely to ensure the financial viability of the centres, his delegation agreed that more complete information would have been better and might have resulted in the resolution being adopted by consensus in the First Committee. But the logic inherent in the decision was perfectly clear, namely, that the centres had an important role, that they were inadequately funded, and that their administrative costs should be met from the regular budget so that voluntary contributions could be used exclusively for substantive activities. The Secretary-General's view that there was a continued need for voluntary contributions did not mean that the administrative costs should not be covered from the regular budget. The amount in question could in fact be met from the contingency fund. His delegation could accept some review of the number of local level posts required and the amount of $600,000 requested for that purpose. The Advisory Committee's view that if voluntary funding of substantive activities fell short of expectations, financing of those activities under the regular budget would be requested, was simply an opinion. Lastly, the detailed report recommended by the Advisory Committee concerning the financial position, programme of work and functional breakdown of staff at each centre should be provided at the current session.

16. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the attempt by the First Committee to secure regular budget funding for the regional centres did not amount to interference in the work of the Fifth Committee and the Advisory Committee. The decision was purely political. The First Committee was not seeking to define the administrative and budgetary structure of the centres but simply to correct

(Mr. Dankwa, Ghana)

shortcomings in their functioning. There were many precedents for such action. While there was a point beyond which other Committees could not go without trespassing on the Fifth Committee's domain, the First Committee had not overstepped the mark.

17. With regard to the Advisory Committee's recommendation for a comprehensive study, the First Committee was not proposing anything new since the centres already existed, but were not being funded adequately. Concerning the comment of the Advisory Committee that the Secretary-General had made no case for the financing of the centres' administrative expenses, such a matter was not within the purview of the Secretary-General, given that a political decision had already been taken by the First Committee. The only role that the Secretary-General was called upon to play was to determine the costs involved, and the only role of the Advisory Committee was to determine whether the Secretary-General's estimates were adequate or not. The Advisory Committee must not be used to overturn political decisions taken in other Committees. Accordingly, the Advisory Committee should reconsider its recommendations and confine itself to stating whether the estimates were enough to ensure the funding of the regional centres.

18. Mr. BISTA (Nepal) said that the mandate of the regional centres for peace and disarmament was to provide substantive support for the initiatives and other activities mutually agreed upon by Member States of the region for the implementation of measures for peace and disarmament. The report of the Secretary-General (A/46/365) gave an excellent summary of the activities of the regional centres over the previous few years.

19. The Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific in Kathmandu, Nepal, had been engaged in important work relating to confidence-building measures in the Asia-Pacific region, and had organized two major meetings in Kathmandu in an effort to identify areas involving common approach and elements for possible future agreements. His delegation believed that the potential of the regional centres should be viewed in terms of the importance of confidence- and security-building measures in their respective regions.

20. The Department for Disarmament Affairs was to be commended for the optimal use it had been making of the meagre resources available to the centres, which depended exclusively on voluntary contributions. It was with that in mind that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 had decided to approach the General Assembly with a view to obtaining the financing for the three centres from the regular budget. He concurred with the remarks of the Peruvian and Ghanaian representatives and hoped that a decision could be taken during the current session.

21. Mr. CLAVIJO (Colombia) said that the Fifth Committee must not lose sight of the medium-term plan, or of the fact that its first priority must be international peace, especially in the current political circumstances, where

(Mr. Clavijo, Colombia)

it was obvious that the regional role of the United Nations was growing in importance. The Fifth Committee was being asked to guarantee the survival of the regional centres, and that was in keeping with the medium-term plan. In paragraph 17 of document A/46/7/Add.11, the Advisory Committee had recommended that the General Assembly should request the Secretary-General to provide more information about the centres. By inquiring into the nature of their work it would in essence be evaluating that work, but that was something to which all United Nations bodies were subject. Such an evaluation must not, however, imperil the short-term survival of the centres. The Secretariat must already have much of the requested information on hand; even if it was not very detailed, it would no doubt be sufficient for the Advisory Committee to assess how realistic the funding proposal was. His delegation felt that the Committee should decide to support the centres in accordance with the medium-term plan and agree to an evaluation of their work within a reasonable time. That would ensure their immediate survival and guarantee their future viability. Although extrabudgetary contributions could be useful, priority activities of the Organization should as far as possible have guaranteed funding, and should therefore be financed from the regular budget.

22. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted against draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 in the First Committee, basically on financial grounds: it did not feel that the budget of the Department for Disarmament Affairs should be increased to finance the functioning of the centres. The work of the centres had changed dramatically in the past few years, and while they could play a useful role, their activities should be financed by a redeployment of the existing resources of the Department. In that connection, it should be recalled that over twenty countries had voted against paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, which called for the administrative costs of the centres to be financed from the regular budget. His delegation was not convinced that the Advisory Committee had overturned a political decision of the First Committee, as some had claimed. Paragraph 4 of the draft resolution set no specific time-frame for regular budget financing of the centres' administrative costs, and the Advisory Committee had requested the kind of information needed to determine what their administrative costs and programme activities actually were. The programme budget provided very little information on that score and the Fifth Committee should not appropriate $600,000 without having some indication how those funds would be spent. He would like the Chairman of the Advisory Committee to explain more fully the intent of that body's proposal and its relationship to the decision taken in the First Committee. The information requested by the Advisory Committee would be useful, but he doubted whether it could be provided in all official languages before the closure of the session. In view of the very full agenda of the Fifth Committee, it might be advisable to hold informal consultations on the item.

23. The CHAIRMAN said there appeared to be two currents of opinion in the Committee. One was that no additional appropriation would be needed for the biennium 1992-1993 pending the report of the Secretary-General called for in paragraph 17 of document A/46/7/Add.11. The other was that an additional

(The Chairman)

appropriation of $600,000 would be needed under section 5 of the proposed programme budget for 1992-1993. Therefore, as the United States representative had suggested, it might be advisable for the delegations concerned to undertake informal discussions on the matter and to present their findings to the Plenary Committee.

24. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) said that his delegation would have liked to see the funds earmarked for the Register of Conventional Arms redeployed to the regional centres. He agreed with the representative of Ghana that the First Committee's proposal was reasonable; it had not overstepped its authority, but had simply left the details to the Fifth Committee. He wished to know whether the Secretariat could provide the necessary information on the centres.

25. Mr. DUVAL (Programme Planning and Budget Division) said that the Secretariat would, if so requested, make every effort to put together a report within the week, but at the current stage he could not make any commitment as to the scope or depth of the analysis or the date when such information could be submitted.

26. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the Advisory Committee's recommendations to the Fifth Committee never intentionally went beyond its mandate. On the question of additional information, the timing was important: he doubted whether it was feasible to provide the additional information requested by the Advisory Committee and still meet the 17 December deadline set by the General Assembly, and he would therefore propose that the Chairman should invite the Fifth Committee to send a procedural recommendation to the General Assembly informing it that adoption of the relevant resolutions would give rise to up to $600,000 under the regular budget, but that the actual additional appropriation would be considered by the Assembly later in the current session. Such action had been taken in the past. Adoption of the First Committee resolutions by the General Assembly should not be delayed.

27. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) said he wished to ask two questions. First, the Secretary-General had requested $600,000 for the implementation of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14. The Advisory Committee reported in paragraph 1 of document A/46/7/Add.11 that during its consideration of the relevant statement of programme implications, it had met with representatives of the Secretary-General, who had provided additional information. He wondered why the Advisory Committee had not taken advantage of that opportunity to ask the representatives of the Secretary-General for the information referred to in paragraph 17 of the report. Secondly, since the First Committee had recommended that funding for the centres should come from the regular budget, he wondered why the Advisory Committee had mentioned a subvention in paragraph 17 of its report.

28. With reference to the last comment by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, the amount of $600,000 had been presented to the Fifth Committee as an expense to be financed from the contingency fund; if by the end of the

(Mr. Monthe, Cameroon)

session, when updated information on the programme budget implications of the resolution would be available, the contingency fund did cover the whole cost, there would be no problem. It was true that the Secretary-General had said, in paragraph 10 of document A/C.5/46/43, that "should it not prove possible to meet the costs required from the Contingency Fund, the implementation of the draft resolution may have to be postponed, as provided for in the guidelines for the use of the Contingency Fund". However, his delegation believed that something must remain of the previous $15 million balance in the contingency fund and that there would presumably be no difficulties if the Fifth Committee adopted the amount of $600,000 as a contingency fund expense. He supported the last proposal of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee, and felt that the matter should not be deferred.

29. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14 of the First Committee, since the Secretariat's work to promote disarmament required the sustained support of Member States. However, it had abstained from voting on paragraph 4, because it felt that the matter was not one which necessarily fell within the First Committee's competence. The proposals of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee could form the basis for an agreement. The criticism of the Advisory Committee was not entirely fair. The question at issue was whether the regular budget should be used to finance non-mandatory activities. It was difficult to decipher the intentions of the First Committee regarding the source of financing for the activities envisaged in the draft resolution. Article 17 of the Charter required careful interpretation in relation to that problem. In order to make an informed judgement in the current circumstances, the Fifth Committee needed the information requested by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 17 of its report, but since there was some doubt whether that information could be provided by the end of the session, he proposed that the Fifth Committee should indicate to the General Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution might require up to $600,000 in additional appropriations, and that the matter should be discussed at a resumed session of the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly.

30. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the representative of Cameroon, said that paragraph 17 of the report had been written after the Advisory Committee had requested and had received additional information from the Secretariat. That information had not, however, been the kind of information the Advisory Committee required to make a judgement as to whether $600,000 was or was not adequate. The proposal of the Secretary-General was that $600,000 would be needed but the Advisory Committee had not been informed regarding the basis on which that amount had been proposed. Administrative support was related to the level of operational programmes and the Advisory Committee would therefore wish to know the size of the operations and the scope of the activities in order to justify $600,000. The Advisory Committee had therefore recommended that the Secretary-General should be requested to provide some additional information, in the manner indicated in paragraph 17, so that it would have an adequate basis on which to make an informed judgement on the amount.

(Mr. Mselle)

31. If that information was provided during the current session, namely, before the end of December, he frankly could not give an assurance that the Advisory Committee would be able to consider the information and report to the Fifth Committee before the end of December. The agenda before the Advisory Committee was heavily loaded with several items on peace-keeping operations which involved many millions of dollars and must be given priority as the General Assembly must approve the peace-keeping operations before adjourning late in December 1991. He continued to believe that the proposal which he had made and which had been amended by Japan and supported by Cameroon was the best.

32. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the plenary Assembly that adoption of the draft resolution might require financing of up to $600,000 and that the actual appropriation of the amount would be reviewed at a later stage at a resumed session.

33. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, if the suggestion of the Chairman was adopted, the term used should be "actual appropriation". No mention should be made of $600,000.

34. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the proposal made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee was quite attractive. It would be logical to consider the matter in the context of the consolidated statement of programme budget implications. It might then be decided that the actual amount of the disbursement would be determined by the Advisory Committee after it had received the promised report from the Secretariat. The Fifth Committee must, however, take the final decision and have it reflected in the budget. In the meantime the Fifth Committee should emphasize the procedural aspects of the question and indicate that it would consider the matter further in the context of the consolidated statement of programme budget implications.

35. Mr. BIDNY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) expressed the view that the matter should be considered further in informal consultations.

36. Mr. MONTHE (Cameroon) supported the representative of Ghana and also the proposal of the Chairman of the Advisory Committee.

37. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that his delegation had serious problems which went beyond the amount of $600,000 but he nevertheless felt that the Fifth Committee was close to a decision. In his view time was needed in informal consultations to work out appropriate language.

38. Mr. INOMATA (Japan) said that most of the problems appeared to have been solved by the Chairman's latest proposals which his delegation supported. He assured the representatives of Cameroon and Ghana that a consolidated statement of programme budget implications was not required. There were a number of precedents in which the Secretary-General had committed money using

(Mr. Inomata, Japan)

the contingency fund provisions as, for example, in the cases of Haiti and the cost of preparing for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. In such cases appropriations were of course made at a later stage but the commitments had been made by the Secretary-General and had not been opposed by either the Advisory Committee or the General Assembly. He therefore proposed formally that the Committee should take a decision on the text proposed by the Chairman.

39. At the request of Mr. DANKWA (Ghana), the CHAIRMAN said that his proposal was that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.14, the activities called for would fall under subparagraph 2 (c) (i) of subprogramme 4 of section 5 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 and that accordingly no modifications would be required. Furthermore, adoption of the draft resolution might require up to $600,000 and the appropriation would be reviewed at a later stage in a resumed session.

40. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) suggested that the Chairman might add to his proposed text wording recalling the Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding the report on the centres. His delegation could then support the formulation on the understanding that the issue of the appropriation would be dealt with in the context of the report by the Secretary-General on the basis of the recommendations in the Advisory Committee's report.

41. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions), replying to the representative of the United States, said that a second sentence would be required in which the General Assembly would simply concur in the observations and recommendations made by the Advisory Committee in its report. Regarding the point raised by the representative of Ghana, the Fifth Committee should frankly state that the actual additional appropriation would be considered at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly in accordance with the procedure for the use and operation of the contingency fund and leave it at that.

42. Mrs. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) asked whether, if the Committee approved the recommendation made by the Advisory Committee in paragraph 17 of its report there might not be a contradiction with the proposal made by the First Committee regarding the amendment of the current provisions concerning the financing of the centres.

43. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that, if the Fifth Committee merely called on the General Assembly to concur in paragraph 17, that action would not contradict the recommendation of the First Committee. Paragraph 17 would start the process whereby the actual amount to be financed from the regular budget would be determined. It was not up to the First Committee to determine the actual resources to be allocated. Only the Fifth Committee could do that, on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

44. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) considered that the actual appropriation should be made on the basis of the report by the Secretary-General but that a time-limit, namely the end of February 1992 should be incorporated in the proposed decision. His delegation would not be happy with a reference to the forty-sixth session, which would end in September 1992.

45. Mr. IRUMBA (Uganda) agreed with the proposal made by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee. The appropriation should be dealt with in the context of the contingency fund procedures.

46. Mr. CONMY (Ireland) suggested that the phrase "as soon as possible during the forty-sixth session" might take care of the timing aspect. In regard to the proposal by the United States representative, he would suggest the following wording: "Bearing in mind the report of the Advisory Committee and in particular paragraph 17".

47. At the request of the CHAIRMAN, Mr. TIEWUL (Secretary of the Committee) read out the following text of the proposal to be considered by the Fifth Committee:

> "The Committee informs the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/46/L.14, the activities called for would fall under subparagraph 2 (c) (i) of subprogramme 4 of section 5 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. Second, the Committee informs the General Assembly that the adoption of the draft resolution may require up to $600,000 and that the actual additional appropriation would be reviewed as soon as possible during the forty-sixth session in accordance with the procedures for the operation and use of the contingency fund. Finally, the Committee informs the General Assembly that, bearing in mind the comments and observations of the Advisory Committee, it would review the matter further in the light of the report to be submitted by the Secretary-General."

48. Mr. DANKWA (Ghana) said that the proposal would be acceptable to his delegation provided the words "and the views expressed in the Fifth Committee" were added after "comments and observations of the Advisory Committee" in the last sentence.

49. Mr. MICHALSKI (United States of America) said that the proposed wording would meet the concerns of his delegation but suggested that the amendment proposed by the representative of Ghana should read "and all the views expressed by delegations in the Fifth Committee".

50. The proposal of the Chairman, as amended, was adopted.

51. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider the statement of programme budget implications (A/C.5/46/44) relating to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1. On the basis of the Secretary-General's report and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, he proposed that the following

(The Chairman)

should be added under subprogramme 3 of section 5 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993: under activity 1, "Parliamentary services", "(v) Panel of governmental technical experts on international arms transfers (three sessions in 1992)"; under activity 3, "Coordination, harmonization and liaison", "(iv) Establishing and maintaining a universal and non-discriminatory Register of Conventional Arms". The programmatic aspects of the activities called for by paragraph 11 (b) of the draft resolution would be considered within the framework of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1994-1995; no additional appropriation would be required for the biennium 1992-1993.

52. It was so decided.

53. Mrs. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) said that her delegation had not requested a vote on the financial implications of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.18/Rev.1. However, if there had been a vote her delegation would have voted against it. The draft resolution was discriminatory as it dealt only with certain aspects of the issue and did not cover such aspects as production and supplies. She wished her statement to be duly reflected in the Committee's report.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/C.6/46/L.7 concerning agenda item 131 (A/C.5/46/41)

54. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) noted that the resolution on the report of the Special Committee on the Charter of the United Nations and on the Strengthening of the Role of the Organization (A/C.6/46/L.7) called on the Special Committee to continue its activities and to hold its next session from 3 to 21 February 1992. It also requested the Secretary-General to publish and disseminate widely the Handbook on the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes between States. The conference servicing requirement for the session in New York was $298,000 and, since that amount was covered under section 32 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993, no additional appropriations were required.

55. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/46/41) and the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee wished to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/C.6/46/L.7, no additional appropriations would be required under sections 9 and 32 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

56. It was so decided.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.9 concerning agenda item 74 (A/C.5/46/49)

57. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) said that the adoption by the General Assembly of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.9 on the comprehensive review of the whole question of peace-keeping operations in all their aspects would call for no additional appropriations under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

58. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/46/49) and the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee wished to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.9, the modifications described in paragraphs 7 and 8 of document A/C.5/46/49 would be required in the proposed programme of work for 1992-1993, and that it was not anticipated that additional appropriations would be required under the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

59. It was so decided.

60. Mrs. GOICOCHEA (Cuba) said that her delegation was still awaiting a response to comments made during the first reading in connection with section 2 of the proposed programme budget.

Programme budget implications of draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and A/46/L.28 concerning agenda item 19 (A/C.5/46/57)

61. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) noted that the programme of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted annually by the General Assembly. In paragraph 6 of his statement (A/C.5/46/57), the Secretary-General pointed out that the full cost of implementing the programme of regular activities under draft resolution A/46/L.27 in 1992 was estimated at $309,000, and that a detailed breakdown of that estimate was provided in the annex to the statement. However, in paragraph 13 the Secretary-General indicated that no more than $216,300 would be required, a figure within the provisions of section 6 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. The adoption of draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and L.28 by the General Assembly would therefore call for no additional appropriations under the programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993.

62. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/46/57) and the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee wished to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolutions A/46/L.27 and L.28, their implementation would not require any modification of the relevant subprogramme under sections 6C or 31 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 and that the estimated requirements of $216,300 would fall within the provisions under section 6 of that proposed

(The Chairman)

programme budget and no additional resources over and above those proposed under sections 6 and 31 for the 1992-1993 biennium would be required.

63. It was so decided.

64. Mr. KINCHEN (United Kingdom) expressed his delegation's concern at the continuing practice of over-budgeting in the section in question. Out of respect for the consensus budgetary procedure established by resolution 41/213, his delegation did not intend to request a vote on the issue, but it urged the need for maximum restraint within the overall level of the contingency fund. The Committee's competence in regard to adminstrative and budgetary matters must be respected if the survival of the budgetary procedure was not to be called in question. He welcomed the Controller's circular letter to the Chairmen of the Main Committees concerning the correct budgetary procedures to be followed, but regretted that it had not been issued earlier.

Programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6 concerning agenda item 75 (A/C.5/46/50)

65. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) noted that draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6 on United Nations public information policies and activities had been adopted without a vote on the basis of the information contained in document A/C.5/46/50 and its annex. The Advisory Committee wished to point out that the adoption of the draft resolution would give rise to estimated expenditure of $892,100 under the regular budget but that no additional appropriations would be required under section 31 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. The Department of Public Information should be instructed to implement all the activities called for in the draft resolution using the resources available to it through redeployment, including the procedures indicated in the annex to the statement of programme budget implications.

66. The CHAIRMAN said he would take it that, on the basis of the statement of programme budget implications submitted by the Secretary-General (A/C.5/46/50) and the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, the Fifth Committee wished to inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.6, no additional appropriations would be required under section 31 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1991-1992.

Administrative and financial arrangements regarding the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (A/46/480, A/C.5/46/23 and A/46/7/Add.9)

67. Mr. MSELLE (Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions) noted that at its forty-fifth session the General Assembly had adopted resolution 45/179, calling for the establishment of a single drug control programme based at Vienna and fully integrating the structures and functions of the Division of Narcotic Drugs of the Secretariat, the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board and the United

(Mr. Mselle)

Nations Fund for Drug Abuse Control. The General Assembly's decision had been taken after many years of debate and was necessary in order to enhance policy coordination on drug abuse control programmes and activities. The Secretary-General had submitted reports on the measures taken to implement General Assembly resolution 45/179 and on the administrative and financial arrangements regarding the United Nations International Drug Control Programme, and the Advisory Committee's views on those reports were set forth in document A/46/7/Add.9.

68. In its report, the Advisory Committee noted that the those structures had been integrated as decided (para. 3), but expressed reservations as to the proposed organizational structure which, given the limited resource base, was unrealistic and needed to be streamlined (para. 7). The establishment of the new Programme had policy implications for the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, which had been requested by the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council to review its functions and provide policy guidance for the Programme. In addition, the Commission's membership had been increased from 40 to 53 under the terms of Economic and Social Council resolution 1991/49. However, the Advisory Committee felt that the General Assembly should clarify the role of the Commission, since it was not clear whether it was empowered to approve the operational programme and administrative budget of the Drug Control Programme. He personally felt that it should be so empowered; if that was done, the Advisory Committee would submit its reports on the Fund of the Programme to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs (para. 4).

69. As requested by the General Assembly, the Secretary-General had appointed an Executive Director of the Drug Control Programme, but there was considerable disagreement within the Advisory Committee as to whether the degree of autonomy to be given to the Executive Director under the Secretary-General's proposals met with the wishes of the Member States, as expressed in resolution 45/179. The Advisory Committee felt that the matter was open to question (para. 11) and therefore could not endorse or pronounce itself on the personnel arrangements outlined in document A/C.5/46/23.

70. With regard to the Secretary-General's proposal that the Executive Director's post should be converted from a temporary to an established one, (para. 12), the Advisory Committee reiterated its previously expressed view (A/45/7/Add.11) that the appointment of such a senior official should be accommodated within the existing number of posts at that level. On the question of the financial rules applicable to the Fund (para. 14), the Advisory Committee believed that the Secretary-General should ensure that the rules eventually promulgated were consistent with the relevant General Assembly decisions. They would therefore need to be reviewed in the light of any action taken by the General Assembly at its current session. Although the General Assembly was not required to approve the financial rules for the United Nations International Drug Control Programme, it did need to record its understanding with regard to the application of the United Nations Financial Regulations to the Programme, and the Advisory Committee recommended a number of actions to be taken in that connection (para. 16).

The meeting rose at 1.50 p.m.